

Quantum Teleportation with Entangled States given by Beam Splittings

Karl-Heinz Fichtner

Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena

Fakultät für Mathematik und Informatik

Institut für Angewandte Mathematik

D-07740 Jena Deutschland

E-mail: fichtner@minet.uni-jena.de

and

Masanori Ohya

Department of Information Sciences

Science University of Tokyo

Chiba 278-8510 Japan

E-mail: ohya@is.noda.sut.ac.jp

August 1999

Abstract

Quantum teleportation is rigorously discussed with coherent entangled states given by beam splittings. The mathematical scheme of beam splitting has been used to study quantum communication [2] and quantum stochastic [8]. We discuss the teleportation process by means of coherent states in this scheme for the following two cases: (1) Delete the vacuum part from coherent states, whose compensation provides us a perfect teleportation from Alice to Bob. (2) Use fully realistic (physical) coherent states, which gives a non-perfect teleportation but shows that it is exact when the average energy (density) of the coherent vectors goes to infinity.

It is the paper [3] that the quantum teleportation was first studied as a part of quantum cryptology [5]. This teleportation scheme can be mathematically expressed in the following steps [11]:

Step 0: A girl named Alice has an unknown quantum state ρ on (a N -dimensional) Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_1$ and she was asked to teleport it to a boy named Bob.

Step 1: For this purpose, we need two other Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_2$ and $\mathcal{H}_3$, $\mathcal{H}_2$ is attached to Alice and $\mathcal{H}_3$ is attached to Bob. Prearrange a so-called entangled state σ on $\mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3$ having certain correlations and prepare an ensemble of the combined system in the state $\rho \otimes \sigma$ on $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3$.

Step 2: One then fixes a family of mutually orthogonal projections $(F_{nm})_{n,m=1}^N$ on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ corresponding to an observable $F := \sum_{n,m} z_{n,m} F_{nm}$, and for a fixed one pair of indices n, m , Alice performs a first kind incomplete measurement, involving only the $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ part of the system in the state $\rho \otimes \sigma$, which filters the value z_{nm} , that is, after measurement on the given ensemble $\rho \otimes \sigma$ of identically prepared systems, only those where F shows the value z_{nm} are allowed to pass. According to the von Neumann rule, after Alice's measurement, the state becomes

$$\rho_{nm}^{(123)} := \frac{(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})\rho \otimes \sigma(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})}{\text{tr}_{123}(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})\rho \otimes \sigma(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})}$$

where tr_{123} is the full trace on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3$.

Step 3: Bob is informed which measurement was done by Alice. This is equivalent to transmit the information that the eigenvalue z_{nm} was detected. This information is transmitted from Alice to Bob without disturbance and by means of classical tools.

Step 4: Making only partial measurements on the third part on the system in the state $\rho_{nm}^{(123)}$ means that Bob will control a state $\Lambda_{nm}(\rho)$ on $\mathcal{H}_3$ given by the partial trace on $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ of the state $\rho_{nm}^{(123)}$ (after Alice's measurement)

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{nm}(\rho) &= \text{tr}_{12} \rho_{nm}^{(123)} \\ &= \text{tr}_{12} \frac{(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})\rho \otimes \sigma(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})}{\text{tr}_{123}(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})\rho \otimes \sigma(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})} \end{aligned}$$

Thus the whole teleportation scheme given by the family (F_{nm}) and the entangled state σ can be characterized by the family (Λ_{nm}) of channels from the set of states on $\mathcal{H}_1$ into the set of states on $\mathcal{H}_3$ and the family (p_{nm}) given by

$$p_{nm}(\rho) := \text{tr}_{123}(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})\rho \otimes \sigma(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})$$

of the probabilities that Alice's measurement according to the observable F will show the value z_{nm} .

The teleportation scheme works perfectly with respect to a certain class $\mathfrak{S}$ of states ρ on $\mathcal{H}_1$ if the following conditions are fulfilled.

(E1) For each n, m there exists a unitary operator $v_{nm} : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_3$ such that

$$\Lambda_{nm}(\rho) = v_{nm} \rho v_{nm}^* \quad (\rho \in \mathfrak{S})$$

(E2)

$$\sum_{nm} p_{nm}(\rho) = 1 \quad (\rho \in \mathfrak{S})$$

(E1) means that Bob can reconstruct the original state ρ by unitary keys $\{v_{nm}\}$ provided to him.

(E2) means that Bob will succeed to find a proper key with certainty.

In the papers [3, 4], the authors used EPR spin pair to construct a teleportation model. In order to have a more handy model, we here use coherent states to construct a model. One of the main points for such a construction is how to prepare the entangled state. The EPR entangled state used in [3] can be identified with the splitting of a one particle state, so that the teleportation model of Bennett et al. can be described in terms of Fock spaces and splittings, which makes us possible to work the whole teleportation process in general beam splitting scheme. Moreover to work with beams having a fixed number of particles seems to be not realistic, especially in the case of

large distance between Alice and Bob, because we have to take into account that the beams will lose particles (or energy). For that reason one should use a class of beams being insensitive to this loss of particles. That and other arguments lead to superpositions of coherent beams.

In section 2 of this paper, we construct a teleportation model being perfect in the sense of conditions (E1) and (E2), where we take the Boson Fock space $\Gamma(L^2(G)) := \mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{H}_2 = \mathcal{H}_3$ with a certain class ρ of states on this Fock space.

In section 3 we consider a teleportation model where the entangled state σ is given by the splitting of a superposition of certain coherent states. Unfortunately this model doesn't work perfectly, that is, neither (E2) nor (E1) hold. However this model is more realistic than that in the section 2, and we show that this model provides a nice approximation to be perfect. To estimate the difference between the perfect teleportation and non-perfect teleportation, we add a further step in the teleportation scheme:

Step 5: Bob will perform a measurement on his part of the system according to the projection

$$F_+ := \mathbf{1} - |\exp(0)\rangle\langle\exp(0)|$$

where $|\exp(0)\rangle\langle\exp(0)|$ denotes the vacuum state (the coherent state with density 0).

Then our new teleportation channels (we denote it again by Λ_{nm}) have the form

$$\Lambda_{nm}(\rho) := \text{tr}_{12} \frac{(F_{nm} \otimes F_+) \rho \otimes \sigma(F_{nm} \otimes F_+)}{\text{tr}_{123}(F_{nm} \otimes F_+) \rho \otimes \sigma(F_{nm} \otimes F_+)}$$

and the corresponding probabilities are

$$p_{nm}(\rho) := \text{tr}_{123}(F_{nm} \otimes F_+) \rho \otimes \sigma(F_{nm} \otimes F_+)$$

For this teleportation scheme, (E1) is fulfilled. Furthermore we get

$$\sum_{nm} p_{nm}(\rho) = \frac{(1 - e^{-\frac{d}{2}})^2}{1 + (N-1)e^{-d}} \quad (\rightarrow 1 \text{ } (d \rightarrow +\infty))$$

Here N denotes the dimension of the Hilbert space and d is the expectation value of the total number of particles (or energy) of the beam, so that in the case of high density (or energy) “ $d \rightarrow +\infty$ ” of the beam the model works perfectly.

Specializing this model we consider in section 4 the teleportation of all states on a finite dimensional Hilbert space (through the space $\mathbf{R}^k$). Further specialization leads to a teleportation model where Alice and Bob are spatially separated, that is, we have to teleport the information given by the state of our finite dimensional Hilbert space from one region $X_1 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^k$ into another region $X_2 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^k$ with $X_1 \cap X_2 = \emptyset$, and Alice can only perform local measurements (inside of region X_1) as well as Bob (inside of X_2).

1 Basic Notions and Notations

First we collect some basic facts concerning the (symmetric) Fock space. We will introduce the Fock space in a way adapted to the language of counting measures. For details we refer to [6, 7, 8, 2, 9] and other papers cited in [8].

Let G be an arbitrary complete separable metric space. Further, let μ be a locally finite diffuse measure on G , i.e. $\mu(B) < +\infty$ for bounded measurable subsets of G and $\mu(\{x\}) = 0$ for all singletons $x \in G$. In order to describe the teleportation of states on a finite dimensional Hilbert space through the k -dimensional space $\mathbf{R}^k$, especially we are concerned with the case

$$\begin{aligned} G &= \mathbf{R}^k \times \{1, \dots, N\} \\ \mu &= l \times \# \end{aligned}$$

where l is the k -dimensional Lebesgue measure and $\#$ denotes the counting measure on $\{1, \dots, N\}$.

Now by $M = M(G)$ we denote the set of all finite counting measures on G . Since $\varphi \in M$ can be written in the form $\varphi = \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{x_j}$ for some $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and $x_j \in G$ (where δ_x denotes the Dirac measures corresponding to $x \in G$) the elements of M can be interpreted as finite (symmetric) point

configurations in G . We equip M with its canonical σ -algebra $\mathfrak{W}$ (cf. [6], [7]) and we consider the measure F by setting

$$F(Y) := \mathcal{X}_Y(O) + \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n!} \int_{G^n} \mathcal{X}_Y \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{x_j} \right) \mu^n(d[x_1, \dots, x_n])(Y \in \mathfrak{W})$$

Hereby, $\mathcal{X}_Y$ denotes the indicator function of a set Y and O represents the empty configuration, i. e., $O(G) = 0$. Observe that F is a σ -finite measure.

Since μ was assumed to be diffuse one easily checks that F is concentrated on the set of a simple configurations (i.e., without multiple points)

$$\hat{M} := \{\varphi \in M \mid \varphi(\{x\}) \leq 1 \text{ for all } x \in G\}$$

DEFINITION 1.1 $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(G) := L^2(M, \mathfrak{W}, F)$ is called the (symmetric) Fock space over G .

In [6] it was proved that $\mathcal{M}$ and the Boson Fock space $\Gamma(L^2(G))$ in the usual definition are isomorphic. For each $\Phi \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\Phi \neq 0$ we denote by $|\Phi \rangle$ the corresponding normalized vector

$$|\Phi \rangle := \frac{\Phi}{\|\Phi\|}$$

Further, $|\Phi \rangle \langle \Phi|$ denotes the corresponding one-dimensional projection, describing the pure state given by the normalized vector $|\Phi \rangle$. Now, for each $n \geq 1$ let $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}$ be the n -fold tensor product of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{M}$. Obviously, $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}$ can be identified with $L^2(M^n, F^n)$.

DEFINITION 1.2 For a given function $g : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ the function

$\exp(g) : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$\exp(g)(\varphi) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \varphi = 0 \\ \prod_{x \in G, \varphi(\{x\}) > 0} g(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is called exponential vector generated by g .

Observe that $\exp(g) \in \mathcal{M}$ if and only if $g \in L^2(G)$ and one has in this case

$\|\exp(g)\|^2 = e^{\|g\|^2}$ and $|\exp(g)\rangle = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\|g\|^2} \exp(g)$. The projection $|\exp(g)\rangle \langle \exp(g)|$ is called the coherent state corresponding to $g \in L^2(G)$. In the special case $g \equiv 0$ we get the vacuum state

$$|\exp(0)\rangle = \mathcal{X}_{\{0\}}.$$

The linear span of the exponential vectors of $\mathcal{M}$ is dense in $\mathcal{M}$, so that bounded operators and certain unbounded operators can be characterized by their actions on exponential vectors.

DEFINITION 1.3 *The operator $D : \text{dom}(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^{\otimes 2}$ given on a dense domain $\text{dom}(D) \subset \mathcal{M}$ containing the exponential vectors from $\mathcal{M}$ by*

$$D\psi(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) := \psi(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2) \quad (\psi \in \text{dom}(D), \varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in M)$$

is called compound Malliavin derivative.

On exponential vectors $\exp(g)$ with $g \in L^2(G)$, one gets immediately

$$D \exp(g) = \exp(g) \otimes \exp(g) \tag{1}$$

DEFINITION 1.4 *The operator $S : \text{dom}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ given on a dense domain $\text{dom}(S) \subset \mathcal{M}^{\otimes 2}$ containing tensor products of exponential vectors by*

$$S\Phi(\varphi) := \sum_{\tilde{\varphi} \leq \varphi} \Phi(\tilde{\varphi}, \varphi - \tilde{\varphi}) \quad (\Phi \in \text{dom}(S), \varphi \in M)$$

is called compound Skorohod integral.

One gets

$$\langle D\psi, \Phi \rangle_{\mathcal{M}^{\otimes 2}} = \langle \psi, S\Phi \rangle_{\mathcal{M}} \quad (\psi \in \text{dom}(D), \Phi \in \text{dom}(S)) \tag{2}$$

$$S(\exp(g) \otimes \exp(h)) = \exp(g+h) \quad (g, h \in L^2(G)) \tag{3}$$

For more details we refer to [10].

DEFINITION 1.5 *Let T be a linear operator on $L^2(G)$ with $\|T\| \leq 1$. Then the operator $\Gamma(T)$ called second quantization of T is the (uniquely determined) bounded operator on $\mathcal{M}$ fulfilling*

$$\Gamma(T)\exp(g) = \exp(Tg) \quad (g \in L^2(G))$$

Clearly, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(T_1)\Gamma(T_2) &= \Gamma(T_1T_2) \\ \Gamma(T^*) &= \Gamma(T^*) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

It follows that $\Gamma(T)$ is an unitary operator on $\mathcal{M}$ if T is an unitary operator on $L^2(G)$.

LEMMA 1.6 *Let K_1, K_2 be linear operators on $L^2(G)$ with property*

$$K_1^*K_1 + K_2^*K_2 = \mathbf{1} . \tag{5}$$

Then there exists exactly one isometry ν_{K_1, K_2} from $\mathcal{M}$ to $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes 2} = \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{M}$ with

$$\nu_{K_1, K_2}\exp(g) = \exp(K_1g) \otimes \exp(K_2g) \quad (g \in L^2(G)) \tag{6}$$

Further it holds

$$\nu_{K_1, K_2} = (\Gamma(K_1) \otimes \Gamma(K_2))D \tag{7}$$

(at least on $\text{dom}(D)$ but one has the unique extension).

The adjoint ν_{K_1, K_2}^ of ν_{K_1, K_2} is characterized by*

$$\nu_{K_1, K_2}^*(\exp(h) \otimes \exp(g)) = \exp(K_1^*h + K_2^*g) \quad (g, h \in L^2(G)) \tag{8}$$

and it holds

$$\nu_{K_1, K_2}^* = S(\Gamma(K_1^*) \otimes \Gamma(K_2^*)) \tag{9}$$

REMARK 1.7 *From K_1, K_2 we get a transition expectation $\xi_{K_1 K_2} : \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, using ν_{K_1, K_2} and the lifting $\xi_{K_1 K_2}^*$ may be interpreted as a certain splitting (cf. [2]).*

Proof of 1.6. We consider the operator

$$B := S(\Gamma(K_1^*) \otimes \Gamma(K_2^*))(\Gamma(K_1) \otimes \Gamma(K_2))D$$

on the dense domain $\text{dom}(B) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ spanned by the exponential vectors. Using (1), (3), (4) and (5) we get

$$B \exp(g) = \exp(g) \quad (g \in L^2(G)).$$

It follows that the bounded linear unique extension of B onto $\mathcal{M}$ coincides with the unity on $\mathcal{M}$

$$B = \mathbf{1}. \quad (10)$$

On the other hand, by equation (7) at least on $\text{dom}(D)$, an operator ν_{K_1, K_2} is defined. Using (2) and (4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nu_{K_1, K_2} \psi\|^2 &= \langle \nu_{K_1, K_2} \psi, \nu_{K_1, K_2} \psi \rangle \quad (\psi \in \text{dom}(D)) \\ &= \langle \psi, B\psi \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\|\nu_{K_1, K_2} \psi\|^2 = \|\psi\|^2 \quad (\psi \in \text{dom}(D)).$$

because of (10). It follows that ν_{K_1, K_2} can be uniquely extended to a bounded operator on $\mathcal{M}$ with

$$\|\nu_{K_1, K_2} \psi\| = \|\psi\| \quad (\psi \in \mathcal{M}).$$

Now from (7) we obtain (6) using (1) and the definition of the operators of second quantization. Further, (7), (3) and (4) imply (9) and from (9) we obtain (8) using the definition of the operators of second quantization and equation (3). ■

Here we explain fundamental scheme of beam splitting [8]. We define an isometric operator $V_{\alpha, \beta}$ for coherent vectors such that

$$V_{\alpha, \beta} |\exp(g)\rangle = |\exp(\alpha g)\rangle \otimes |\exp(\beta g)\rangle$$

with $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. This beam splitting is a useful mathematical expression for optical communication and quantum measurements [2].

EXAMPLE 1.8 ($\alpha = \beta = 1/\sqrt{2}$ above) *Let $K_1 = K_2$ be the following operator of multiplication on $L^2(G)$*

$$K_1 g = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} g = K_2 g \quad (g \in L^2(G))$$

We put

$$\nu := \nu_{K_1, K_2}$$

and obtain

$$\nu \exp(g) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}g\right) \otimes \exp\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}g\right) \quad (g \in L^2(G))$$

EXAMPLE 1.9 *Let $L^2(G) = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$ be the orthogonal sum of the subspaces $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2$. K_1 and K_2 denote the corresponding projections.*

We will use Example 1.8 in order to describe a teleportation model where Bob performs his experiments on the same ensemble of the systems like Alice.

Further we will use a special case of Example 1.9 in order to describe a teleportation model where Bob and Alice are spatially separated (cf. section 5).

REMARK 1.10 *The property (5) implies*

$$\|K_1 g\|^2 + \|K_2 g\|^2 = \|g\|^2 \quad (g \in L^2(G)) \quad (11)$$

REMARK 1.11 *Let U, V be unitary operators on $L^2(G)$. If operators K_1, K_2 satisfy (5), then the pair $\hat{K}_1 = UK_1, \hat{K}_2 = VK_2$ fulfill (5).*

2 A perfect model of teleportation

Concerning the general idea we follow the papers [11], [1]. We fix an ONS $\{g_1, \dots, g_N\} \subseteq L^2(G)$, operators K_1, K_2 on $L^2(G)$ with (5), an unitary operator T on $L^2(G)$, and $d > 0$. We assume

$$TK_1 g_k = K_2 g_k \quad (k = 1, \dots, N), \quad (12)$$

$$\langle K_1 g_k, K_1 g_j \rangle = 0 \quad (k \neq j; k, j = 1, \dots, N), \quad (13)$$

Using (11) and (12) we get

$$\|K_1 g_k\|^2 = \|K_2 g_k\|^2 = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (14)$$

From (12) and (13) we get

$$\langle K_2 g_k, K_2 g_j \rangle = 0 \quad (k \neq j; k, j = 1, \dots, N). \quad (15)$$

The state of Alice asked to teleport is of the type

$$\rho = \sum_{s=1}^N \lambda_s |\Phi_s\rangle \langle \Phi_s|, \quad (16)$$

where

$$|\Phi_s\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^N c_{sj} |\exp(aK_1 g_j) - \exp(0)\rangle \quad \left(\sum_j |c_{sj}|^2 = 1; s = 1, \dots, N \right) \quad (17)$$

and $a = \sqrt{d}$. One easily checks that $(|\exp(aK_1 g_j) - \exp(0)\rangle)_{j=1}^N$ and $(|\exp(aK_2 g_j) - \exp(0)\rangle)_{j=1}^N$ are ONS in $\mathcal{M}$.

In order to achieve that $(|\Phi_s\rangle)_{s=1}^N$ is still an ONS in $\mathcal{M}$ we assume

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \bar{c}_{sj} c_{kj} = 0 \quad (j \neq k; j, k = 1, \dots, N). \quad (18)$$

Denote $c_s = [c_{s1}, \dots, c_{sN}] \in \mathbb{C}^N$, then $(c_s)_{s=1}^N$ is an CONS in $\mathbb{C}^N$.

Now let $(b_n)_{n=1}^N$ be a sequence in $\mathbb{C}^N$,

$$b_n = [b_{n1}, \dots, b_{nN}]$$

with properties

$$|b_{nk}| = 1 \quad (n, k = 1, \dots, N), \quad (19)$$

$$\langle b_n, b_j \rangle = 0 \quad (n \neq j; n, j = 1, \dots, N). \quad (20)$$

Then Alice's measurements are performed with projection

$$F_{nm} = |\xi_{nm}\rangle\langle\xi_{nm}| \quad (n, m = 1, \dots, N) \quad (21)$$

given by

$$|\xi_{nm}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^N b_{nj} |\exp(aK_1 g_j) - \exp(0)\rangle \otimes |\exp(aK_1 g_{j \oplus m}) - \exp(0)\rangle, \quad (22)$$

where $j \oplus m := j + m \pmod{N}$.

One easily checks that $(|\xi_{nm}\rangle)_{n,m=1}^N$ is an ONS in $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes 2}$. Further, the state vector $|\xi\rangle$ of the entangled state $\sigma = |\xi\rangle\langle\xi|$ is given by

$$|\xi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_k |\exp(aK_1 g_k) - \exp(0)\rangle \otimes |\exp(aK_2 g_k) - \exp(0)\rangle. \quad (23)$$

LEMMA 2.1 *For each $n, m = 1, \dots, N$ it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} & (F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})(|\Phi_s\rangle \otimes |\xi\rangle) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} |\xi_{nm}\rangle \otimes \sum_j \bar{b}_{nj} c_{sj} |\exp(aK_2 g_{j \oplus m}) - \exp(0)\rangle \quad (s = 1, \dots, N) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Proof: From the fact that

$$|\gamma_j\rangle := |\exp(aK_1 g_j) - \exp(0)\rangle \quad (j = 1, \dots, N) \quad (25)$$

is an ONS, it follows

$$\langle \gamma_r \otimes \gamma_{r \oplus m}, \gamma_j \otimes \gamma_k \rangle = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r = j \text{ and } k = r \oplus m \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (26)$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})(|\Phi_s\rangle \otimes |\xi\rangle) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_k \sum_j \sum_r c_{sj} \bar{b}_{ns} \langle \gamma_r \otimes \gamma_{r \oplus m}, \gamma_j \otimes \gamma_k \rangle \xi_{nm} \otimes |\exp(aK_2 g_k) - \exp(0)\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Using (26) and (27), we get (24) ■

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}\rho \otimes \sigma &= \sum_{s=1}^N \lambda_s |\Phi_s\rangle \langle \Phi_s| \otimes |\xi\rangle \langle \xi| \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^N \lambda_s |\Phi_s \otimes \xi\rangle \langle \Phi_s \otimes \xi| ,\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})(\rho \otimes \sigma)(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1}) &= \sum_{s=1}^N \lambda_s (F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1}) |\Phi_s \otimes \xi\rangle \langle \Phi_s \otimes \xi| (F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1}) \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^N \lambda_s \|(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})(\Phi_s \otimes \xi)\|^2 \\ &\quad |(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})(\Phi_s \otimes \xi)\rangle \langle (F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})(\Phi_s \otimes \xi)|.\end{aligned}\tag{29}$$

Note $|\Phi_s \otimes \xi\rangle = |\Phi_s\rangle \otimes |\xi\rangle$. From (12) it follows that

$$\sum_j \bar{b}_{nj} c_{sj} |\exp(aK_2 g_{j \oplus m}) - \exp(0)\rangle = \Gamma(T) \sum_j \bar{b}_{nj} c_{sj} |\exp(aK_1 g_{j \oplus m}) - \exp(0)\rangle.\tag{30}$$

Further, for each $m, n (= 1, \dots, N)$, we have unitary operators U_m, B_n on $\mathcal{M}$ given by

$$B_n |\exp(aK_1 g_j) - \exp(0)\rangle = b_{nj} |\exp(aK_1 g_j) - \exp(0)\rangle \quad (j = 1, \dots, N)\tag{31}$$

$$U_m |\exp(aK_1 g_j) - \exp(0)\rangle = |\exp(aK_1 g_{j \oplus m}) - \exp(0)\rangle \quad (j = 1, \dots, N)\tag{32}$$

Therefore we get

$$\sum_j \bar{b}_{nj} c_{sj} |\exp(aK_1 g_{j \oplus m}) - \exp(0)\rangle = U_m B_n^*(\Phi_s)\tag{33}$$

From (30), (33) and Lemma 2.1 we obtain

$$(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})(|\Phi_s\rangle \otimes |\xi\rangle) = \frac{1}{N} |\xi_{nm}\rangle \otimes (\Gamma(T)U_m B_n^* |\Phi_s\rangle) \quad (34)$$

It follows

$$\|(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})(|\Phi_s\rangle \otimes |\xi\rangle)\|^2 = \frac{1}{N^2} \quad (35)$$

Finally from (29), (34) and (35) we have

$$(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})(\rho \otimes \sigma)(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1}) = \frac{1}{N^2} F_{nm} \otimes (\Gamma(T)U_m B_n^*) \rho (B_n U_m^* \Gamma(T^*)) \quad (36)$$

That leads to the following solution of the teleportation problem.

THEOREM 2.2 *For each $n, m = 1, \dots, N$, define a channel Λ_{nm} by*

$$\Lambda_{nm}(\rho) := \text{tr}_{12} \frac{(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})(\rho \otimes \sigma)(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})}{\text{tr}_{123}(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})(\hat{\rho} \otimes \sigma)(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})} \quad (\rho \text{ normal state on } \mathcal{M}) \quad (37)$$

Then we have for all states ρ on M with (16) and (17)

$$\Lambda_{nm}(\rho) = (\Gamma(T)U_m B_n^*) \rho (\Gamma(T)U_m B_n^*)^* \quad (38)$$

REMARK 2.3 *In case of Example 1.8 using the operators $B_n, U_m, \Gamma(T)$, the projections F_{nm} are given by unitary transformations of the entangled state σ :*

$$F_{nm} = (B_n \otimes U_m \Gamma(T^*)) \sigma (B_n \otimes U_m \Gamma(T^*))^* \quad (39)$$

or

$$|\xi_{nm}\rangle = (B_n \otimes U_m \Gamma(T^*)) |\xi\rangle$$

REMARK 2.4 *If Alice performs a measurement according to the following selfadjoint operator*

$$F = \sum_{n,m=1}^N z_{nm} F_{nm}$$

with $\{z_{nm} | n, m = 1, \dots, N\} \subseteq \mathbf{R} - \{0\}$, then she will obtain the value z_{nm} with probability $1/N^2$. The sum over all this probabilities is 1, so that the teleportation model works perfectly.

3 A non-perfect case of Teleportation

In this section we will construct a model where we have also channels with property (38). But the probability that one of these channels will work in order to teleport the state from Alice to Bob is less than 1 depending on the density parameter d (or energy of the beams, depending on the interpretation). If $d = a^2$ tends to infinity that probability tends to 1. That is the model is asymptotically perfect in a certain sense.

We consider the normalized vector

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta\rangle &:= \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N |\exp(ag_k)\rangle \\ \gamma &:= \left(\frac{1}{1 + (N-1)e^{-d}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left(\frac{1}{1 + (N-1)e^{-a^2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

and we replace in (37) the projector σ by the projector

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\sigma} &:= |\tilde{\xi}\rangle\langle\tilde{\xi}| \\ \tilde{\xi} &:= \nu_{K_1, K_2}(\eta) = \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N |\exp(aK_1g_k)\rangle \otimes |\exp(aK_2g_k)\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Then for each $n, m = 1, \dots, N$, we get the channels on a normal state ρ on $\mathcal{M}$ such as

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_{nm}(\rho) := \text{tr}_{12} \frac{(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})(\rho \otimes \tilde{\sigma})(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})}{\text{tr}_{123} (F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})(\rho \otimes \tilde{\sigma})(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1})} \quad (42)$$

$$\Theta_{nm}(\rho) := \text{tr}_{12} \frac{(F_{nm} \otimes F_+)(\rho \otimes \tilde{\sigma})(F_{nm} \otimes F_+)}{\text{tr}_{123} (F_{nm} \otimes F_+)(\rho \otimes \tilde{\sigma})(F_{nm} \otimes F_+)}, \quad (43)$$

where $F_+ = \mathbf{1} - |\exp(0)\rangle\langle\exp(0)|$ e. g., F_+ is the projection onto the space $\mathcal{M}_+$ of configurations having no vacuum part, e. g., orthogonal to vacuum

$$\mathcal{M}_+ := \{\psi \in \mathcal{M} \mid \|\exp(0)\rangle\langle\exp(0)|\psi\| = 0\}$$

One easily checks that

$$\Theta_{nm}(\rho) = \frac{F_+ \tilde{\Lambda}_{nm}(\rho) F_+}{\text{tr} (F_+ \tilde{\Lambda}_{nm}(\rho) F_+)} \quad (44)$$

that is, after receiving the state $\tilde{\Lambda}_{nm}(\rho)$ from Alice, Bob has to omit the vacuum.

From Theorem 2.2 it follows that for all ρ with (16) and (17)

$$\Lambda_{nm}(\rho) = \frac{F_+ \Lambda_{nm}(\rho) F_+}{\text{tr}(F_+ \Lambda_{nm}(\rho) F_+)}$$

This is not true if we replace Λ_{nm} by $\tilde{\Lambda}_{nm}$, namely, in general it does not hold

$$\Theta_{nm}(\rho) = \tilde{\Lambda}_{nm}(\rho)$$

But we will prove that for each ρ with (16), and (17) it holds

$$\Theta_{nm}(\rho) = \Lambda_{nm}(\rho)$$

which means

$$\Theta_{nm}(\rho) = (\Gamma(T)U_m B_n^*)\rho(\Gamma(T)U_m B_n^*)^* \quad (45)$$

because of Theorem 2.2. Further we will show

$$\text{tr}_{123}(F_{nm} \otimes F_+)(\rho \otimes \tilde{\sigma})(F_{nm} \otimes F_+) = \frac{\gamma^2}{N^2} \left(e^{\frac{d}{2}} - 1\right)^2 e^{-d} \quad (46)$$

and the sum over $n, m (= 1, \dots, N)$ gives the probability

$$\frac{\left(1 - e^{-\frac{d}{2}}\right)^2}{1 + (N-1)e^{-d}} \longrightarrow 1 \quad (d \longrightarrow \infty)$$

which means that the teleportation model works perfectly in the limit $d \longrightarrow \infty$, e. g., Bob will receive one of the states $\Theta_{nm}(\rho)$ given by (44). Thus we formulate the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.1 *For all states ρ on $\mathcal{M}$ with (16) and (17) and each pair $n, m (= 1, \dots, N)$, the equations (44) and (45) hold. Further, we have*

$$\sum_{n,m} \text{tr}_{123}(F_{nm} \otimes F_+)(\rho \otimes \tilde{\sigma})(F_{nm} \otimes F_+) = \frac{\left(1 - e^{-\frac{d}{2}}\right)^2}{1 + (N-1)e^{-d}}. \quad (47)$$

In order to prove theorem 3.1, we fix ρ with (16) and (17) and start with a lemma.

LEMMA 3.2 *For each $n, m, s (= 1, \dots, N)$, it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} (F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1}) \left(|\Phi_s\rangle \otimes |\tilde{\xi}\rangle \right) &= \frac{\gamma}{N} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{d}{2}} \right) |\xi_{nm}\rangle \otimes (\Gamma(T)U_m B_n^* |\Phi_s\rangle) \\ &\quad + \frac{\gamma}{N} \left(\frac{e^{\frac{d}{2}} - 1}{e^d} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle b_n, c_s \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^N} \xi_{nm} \otimes |\exp(0)\rangle \end{aligned}$$

Proof: For all $k, j, r = 1, \dots, N$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{k,j,r} &:= \langle |\exp(aK_1 g_r) - \exp(0)\rangle \otimes |\exp(aK_1 g_{r \oplus m}) - \exp(0)\rangle, \\ &\quad |\exp(aK_1 g_j) - \exp(0)\rangle \otimes |\exp(aK_1 g_k)\rangle \rangle \\ &= \begin{cases} \left(\frac{e^{\frac{a^2}{2}} - 1}{e^{\frac{a^2}{2}}} \right) & \text{if } r = j \text{ and } k = r \oplus m \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$|\exp(aK_2 g_{j \oplus m})\rangle = e^{-\frac{a^2}{2}} \left(e^{\frac{a^2}{2}} - 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\exp(aK_2 g_j) - \exp(0)\rangle + e^{-\frac{a^2}{2}} |\exp(0)\rangle$$

On the other hand, we have

$$(F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1}) \left(|\Phi_s\rangle \otimes |\tilde{\xi}\rangle \right) = \frac{\gamma}{N} \sum_k \sum_j \sum_r c_{sj} \bar{b}_{nr} \alpha_{k,j,r} \xi_{nm} \otimes |\exp(aK_2 g_k)\rangle$$

It follows with $a^2 = d$

$$\begin{aligned} (F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1}) \left(|\Phi_s\rangle \otimes |\tilde{\xi}\rangle \right) &= \frac{\gamma}{N} \left(e^{\frac{d}{2}} - 1 \right) e^{-\frac{d}{2}} \xi_{nm} \otimes \left(\sum_j c_{sj} \bar{b}_{nj} |\exp(aK_2 g_{j \oplus m}) - \exp(0)\rangle \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\gamma}{N} \left(e^{\frac{d}{2}} - 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{d}{2}} \sum_j c_{sj} \bar{b}_{nj} \xi_{nm} \otimes |\exp(0)\rangle \\ &= \frac{\gamma}{N} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{d}{2}} \right) \xi_{nm} \otimes (\Gamma(T)U_m B_n^* |\Phi_s\rangle) \\ &\quad + \frac{\gamma}{N} \left(\frac{e^{\frac{d}{2}} - 1}{e^d} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle b_n, c_s \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^N} \xi_{nm} \otimes |\exp(0)\rangle. \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

If ρ is a pure state

$$\rho = |\Phi_s\rangle\langle\Phi_s|$$

then we obtain from Lemma 3.2

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr}_{123} (F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1}) (\rho \otimes \tilde{\sigma}) (F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1}) \\ &= \frac{\gamma^2}{N^2} \left(\left(1 - e^{-\frac{d}{2}}\right)^2 + \frac{e^{\frac{d}{2}-1}}{e^d} |\langle b_n, c_s \rangle|^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2(1+(N-1)e^{-d})} \left(\left(1 - e^{-\frac{d}{2}}\right)^2 + \frac{e^{\frac{d}{2}-1}}{e^d} |\langle b_n, c_s \rangle|^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_{nm}(\rho) \neq (\Gamma(T)U_m B_n^*) \rho (\Gamma(T)U_m B_n^*)^*.$$

Now we have

$$\Gamma(T)U_m B_n^* \Phi_s \in \mathcal{M}_+, \quad |\exp(0)\rangle \in \mathcal{M}_+^\perp$$

Hence, Lemma 3.2 implies

$$(\mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{1} \otimes F_+) (F_{nm} \otimes \mathbf{1}) (\Phi_s \otimes \tilde{\xi}) = \frac{\gamma}{N} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{d}{2}}\right) \xi_{nm} \otimes (\Gamma(T)U_m B_n^* \Phi_s)$$

that is, we have the following Lemma

LEMMA 3.3 *For each $n, m, s = 1, \dots, N$, it holds*

$$(F_{nm} \otimes F_+) (\Phi_s \otimes \tilde{\xi}) = \frac{\gamma}{N} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{d}{2}}\right) \xi_{nm} \otimes (\Gamma(T)U_m B_n^* \Phi_s). \quad (48)$$

REMARK 3.4 *Let K_2 be a projection of the type*

$$K_2 h = h \mathcal{X}_X; \quad h \in L^2(G),$$

where $X \subseteq G$ is measurable. Then (48) also holds if we replace F_+ by the projection $F_{+,X}$ onto the subspace $\mathcal{M}_{+,X}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ given by

$$\mathcal{M}_{+,X} := \{\psi \in \mathcal{M} | \psi(\varphi) = 0 \text{ if } \varphi(X) = 0\}$$

Observe that $\mathcal{M}_{+,G} = \mathcal{M}_+$.

Proof of theorem 3.1: We have assumed that $(|\Phi_s\rangle)_{s=1}^N$ is an ONS in $\mathcal{M}$, which implies that $(|\xi_{nm}\rangle \otimes (\Gamma(T)U_m B_n^* |\Phi_s\rangle))_{s=1}^N$ is an ONS in $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes 3}$. Hence we obtain the equations (45), (46) and (47) by Lemma 3.3. This proves Theorem 3.1. ■

REMARK 3.5 *In the special case of the remark 3.4, the equations (45), (46) and (47) hold if we replace F_+ by $F_{+,X}$ in the definition of the channel Θ_{nm} and in (46), (47), that is, Bob will only perform “local” measurement according to the region X , about which we will discuss more details in the next sections.*

4 Teleportation of states inside $\mathbf{R}^k$

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. We consider the case $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^N = L^2(\{1, \dots, N\}, \#)$ without loss of generality, where $\#$ denotes the counting measure on the set $\{1, \dots, N\}$. We want to teleport states on $\mathcal{H}$ with the aid of the constructed channels $(\Lambda_{nm})_{n,m=1}^N$ or $(\Theta_{nm})_{n,m=1}^N$. We fix

- a CONS $(|j\rangle)_{j=1}^N$ of $\mathcal{H}$
- $f \in L^2(\mathbf{R}^k)$, $\|f\| = 1$
- $d = a^2 > 0$
- $\hat{K}_1, \hat{K}_2$ linear operators on $L^2(\mathbf{R}^k)$
- $\hat{T}$ unitary operator on $L^2(\mathbf{R}^k)$

with two properties

$$\hat{K}_1^* \hat{K}_1 f + \hat{K}_2^* \hat{K}_2 f = f \quad (49)$$

$$\hat{T} \hat{K}_1 f = \hat{K}_2 f \quad (50)$$

We put

$$G = \mathbf{R}^k \times \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad \mu = l \times \#,$$

where l is the Lebesgues measure on $\mathbf{R}^k$. Then $L^2(G) = L^2(G, \mu) = L^2(\mathbf{R}^k) \otimes \mathcal{H}$. Further, put

$$g_j := f \otimes |j\rangle \quad (j = 1, \dots, N)$$

Then $(g_j)_{j=1}^N$ is an ONS in $L^2(G)$. We consider linear operators K_1, K_2 on $L^2(G)$ with (5) and

$$K_r g_j = \left(\hat{K}_r f \right) \otimes |j\rangle \quad (j = 1, \dots, N; \ r = 1, 2). \quad (51)$$

REMARK 4.1 (51) determines operators K_1, K_2 on the subspace of $\mathcal{M}$ spanned by the ONS $(g_j)_{j=1}^N$. On the orthogonal complement, one can put for instance

$$K_r \psi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \psi$$

Then K_1, K_2 are well defined and fulfill (5) because of (49). Further, one checks that (13) and (15) hold.

Now let T be an unitary operator on $L^2(G)$ with

$$T(K_1 g_j) = \left(\hat{T} \hat{K}_2 f \right) \otimes |j\rangle$$

From (13) one can prove the existence of T using the arguments as in the remark 4.1. Further, we get (12) from (50).

Summarizing, we obtain that $\{g_1, \dots, g_N\}$, K_1, K_2, T fulfill all the assumptions required in section 2. Thus we have the corresponding channels $\Lambda_{n,m}$, Θ_{nm} given by (37) and (43) respectively. It follows that we are able to teleport a state ρ on $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(G)$ with (16) and (17) as it was stated in the theorem 2.2 and the theorem 3.1, respectively.

In order to teleport states on $\mathcal{H}$ through the space $\mathbf{R}^k$ using the above channels, we have to consider:

first: a “lifting” $\mathcal{E}^*$ of the states on $\mathcal{H}$ into the set of states on the bigger state space on $\mathcal{M}$ such that $\rho = \mathcal{E}^*(\hat{\rho})$ can be described by (16), (17), (18).

second: a “reduction” $\mathcal{R}$ of (normal) states on $\mathcal{M}$ to states on $\mathcal{H}$ such that for all states $\hat{\rho}$ on $\mathcal{H}$ it holds

$$\mathcal{R}((\Gamma(T)U_m B_n^*) \mathcal{E}^*(\hat{\rho}) (\Gamma(T)U_m B_n^*)^*) = V_{nm} \hat{\rho} V_{nm}^* \quad (n, m = 1, \dots, N), \quad (52)$$

where $(V_{nm})_{n,m=1}^N$ are unitary operators on $\mathcal{H}$.

That we can obtain as follows: We have already stated in section 2 that

$$(|\exp(aK_1(g_j)) - \exp(0)\rangle)_{j=1}^N \quad (r = 1, 2)$$

are ONS in $\mathcal{M}$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}_r$ ($r = 1, 2$) the corresponding N -dimensional subspaces of $\mathcal{M}$. Then for each $r = 1, 2$, there exists exactly one unitary operator W_r from $\mathcal{H}$ onto $\mathcal{M}_r \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ with

$$W_r |j\rangle = |\exp(aK_r g_j) - \exp(0)\rangle \quad (j = 1, \dots, N) \quad (53)$$

We put

$$\mathcal{E}^*(\hat{\rho}) := W_1 \hat{\rho} W_1^* \Pi_{\mathcal{M}_1} \quad (\hat{\rho} \text{ state on } \mathcal{H}), \quad (54)$$

where $\Pi_{\mathcal{M}_r}$ denotes the projection onto $\mathcal{M}_r$ ($r = 1, 2$).

Describing the state $\hat{\rho}$ on $\mathcal{H}$ by

$$\hat{\rho} = \sum_{s=1}^N \lambda_s |\hat{\Phi}_s\rangle \langle \hat{\Phi}_s| \quad (55)$$

with

$$|\hat{\Phi}_s\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^N c_{sj} |j\rangle,$$

where $(c_{sj})_{s,j=1}^N$ fulfills (18), we obtain that $\rho = \mathcal{E}^*(\hat{\rho})$ is given by (16) and (17).

Now, for each state ρ on $\mathcal{M}$ we put

$$\mathcal{R}(\rho) := \frac{W_2^* \Pi_{\mathcal{M}_2} \rho W_2}{\text{tr}_{\mathcal{M}} W_2^* \Pi_{\mathcal{M}_2} \rho W_2} \quad (56)$$

Since

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{M}_2} \Gamma(T) U_m B_n^* \mathcal{E}^*(\hat{\rho}) (\Gamma(T) U_m B_n^*)^* = \Gamma(t) U_m B_n^* \mathcal{E}^*(\hat{\rho}) (\Gamma(T) U_m B_n^*)^*,$$

we get

$$\text{tr}_{\mathcal{M}} W_2^* \Pi_{\mathcal{M}_2} \Gamma(t) U_m B_n^* \mathcal{E}^*(\hat{\rho}) (\Gamma(T) U_m B_n^*)^* = 1$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}(\Gamma(T) U_m B_n^* \mathcal{E}^*(\hat{\rho}) (\Gamma(T) U_m B_n^*)^*) = W_2^* \Gamma(T) U_m B_n^* W_1 \hat{\rho} W_1^* \Pi_{\mathcal{M}_1} (\Gamma(T) U_m B_n^*)^* W_2.$$

As we have the equality

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{M}_1} (\Gamma(T) U_m B_n^*)^* W_2 = (\Gamma(T) U_m B_n^*)^* W_2,$$

which implies

$$\mathcal{R}(\Gamma(T) U_m B_n^* \mathcal{E}^*(\hat{\rho}) (\Gamma(T) U_m B_n^*)^*) = W_2^* \Gamma(T) U_m B_n^* W_1 \hat{\rho} W_1^* (\Gamma(T) U_m B_n^*)^* W_2$$

Put

$$V_{nm} := W_2^* \Gamma(T) U_m B_n^* W_1 \quad (n, m = 1, \dots, N), \quad (57)$$

then V_{nm} ($n, m = 1, \dots, N$) is an unitary operator on $\mathcal{H}$ and (52) holds. One easily checks

$$V_{nm}|j\rangle = \bar{b}_{nj}|j \otimes m\rangle \quad (j, m, n = 1, \dots, N).$$

Summarizing these, we have the following theorem:

THEOREM 4.2 *Consider the channels on the set of states on $\mathcal{H}$*

$$\hat{\Lambda}_{nm} : = \mathcal{R} \circ \Lambda_{nm} \circ \mathcal{E}^* \quad (n, m = 1, \dots, N) \quad (58)$$

$$\hat{\Theta}_{nm} : = \mathcal{R} \circ \Theta_{nm} \circ \mathcal{E}^* \quad (n, m = 1, \dots, N) \quad (59)$$

where $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}^*, \Lambda_{nm}, \Theta_{nm}$ are given by (56), (54), (37), (43), respectively. Then for all states $\hat{\rho}$ on $\mathcal{H}$, it holds

$$\hat{\Lambda}_{nm}(\hat{\rho}) = V_{nm} \hat{\rho} V_{nm}^* = \hat{\Theta}_{nm}(\hat{\rho}) \quad (n, m = 1, \dots, N), \quad (60)$$

where V_{nm} ($n, m = 1, \dots, N$) are the unitary operators on $\mathcal{H}$ given by (57).

REMARK 4.3 *Remember that the teleportation model according to $(\Lambda_{nm})_{n,m=1}^N$ works perfectly in the sense of the remark 2.4, and the model dealing with $(\Theta_{nm})_{n,m=1}^N$ was only asymptotically perfect for large d (i.e., high density or high energy of the beams). They can transfer to $(\hat{\Lambda}_{n,m})$, $(\hat{\Theta}_{nm})$.*

EXAMPLE 4.4 *We specialize*

$$\hat{K}_1 h = \hat{K}_2 h = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} h \quad (h \in L^2(\mathbf{R}^k)), \quad \hat{T} = \mathbf{1}.$$

Realizing the teleportation in this case means that Alice has to perform measurements (F_{nm}) in the whole space $\mathbf{R}^k$ and also Bob (concerning F_+).

5 Alice and Bob are spatially separated

We specialize the situation in section 4 as follows: We fix

- $t \in \mathbf{R}^k$
- $X_1, X_2, X_3 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^k$ are measurable decomposition of $\mathbf{R}^k$ such that $l(X_1) \neq 0$ and

$$X_2 = X_1 + t := \{x + t \mid x \in X_1\}.$$

Put

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}h(x) &:= h(x - t) & (x \in \mathbf{R}^k, h \in L^2(\mathbf{R}^k)) \\ \hat{K}_r h &:= h\chi_{X_r} & (r = 1, 2, h \in L^2(\mathbf{R}^k)) \end{aligned}$$

and assume that the function $f \in L^2(\mathbf{R}^d)$ has the properties

$$f\chi_{X_2} = \hat{T}(f\chi_{X_1}), \quad f\chi_{X_3} \equiv 0$$

Then $\hat{T}$ is an unitary operator on $L^2(\mathbf{R}^k)$ and (48), (49) hold.

Using the assumption that X_1, X_2, X_3 is a measurable decomposition of $\mathbf{R}^k$ we get immediately that

$$G_s := X_s \times \{1, \dots, N\} \quad (s = 1, 2, 3)$$

is a measurable decomposition of G . It follows that $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(G)$ is decomposed into the tensor product

$$\mathcal{M}(G) = \mathcal{M}(G_1) \otimes \mathcal{M}(G_2) \otimes \mathcal{M}(G_3).$$

[6, 7, 10]. According to this representation, the local algebras $\mathfrak{A}(X_s)$ corresponding to regions $X_s \subseteq \mathbf{R}^d$ ($s = 1, 2, 3$) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{A}(X_1) &:= \{A \otimes \mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{1}; A \text{ bounded operator on } \mathcal{M}(G_1)\} \\ \mathfrak{A}(X_2) &:= \{\mathbf{1} \otimes A \otimes \mathbf{1}; A \text{ bounded operator on } \mathcal{M}(G_2)\} \\ \mathfrak{A}(X_3) &:= \{\mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{1} \otimes A; A \text{ bounded operator on } \mathcal{M}(G_3)\} \end{aligned}$$

One easily checks in our special case that

$$F_{nm} \in \mathfrak{A}(X_1) \otimes \mathfrak{A}(X_2) \quad (n, m = 1, \dots, N)$$

and $\mathcal{E}^*(\hat{\rho})$ gives a state on $\mathfrak{A}(X_1)$ (the number of particles outside of G_1 is 0 with probability 1). That is, Alice has to perform only local measurements inside of the region X_1 in order to realize the teleportation processes described in section 4 or measure the state $\mathcal{E}^*(\hat{\rho})$. On the other hand, $\Lambda_{nm}(\mathcal{E}^*(\hat{\rho}))$ and $\Theta_{nm}(\mathcal{E}^*(\hat{\rho}))$ give local states on $\mathfrak{A}(X_2)$ such that by measuring these states Bob has to perform only local measurements inside of the region X_2 . The only problem could be that according to the definition (43) of the channels Θ_{nm} Bob has to perform the measurement by F_+ which is not local. However, as we have already stated in the remark 3.5, this problem can be avoided if we replace F_+ by $F_{+,X_2} \in \mathfrak{A}(X_2)$.

Therefore we can describe the special teleportation process as follows: We have a beam being in the pure state $|\eta\rangle\langle\eta|$ (40). After splitting, one part of the beam is located in the region X_1 or will go to X_1 (cf. remark 1.11) and the other part is located in the region X_2 or will go to X_2 . Further, there is a state $\mathcal{E}^*(\hat{\rho})$ localized in the region X_1 . Now Alice will perform the local measurement inside of X_1 according to $F = \sum_{n,m} z_{nm} F_{nm}$ involving the

first part of the beam and the state $\mathcal{E}^*(\rho)$. This leads to a preparation of the second part of the beam located in the region X_2 which can be controlled by Bob, and the second part of the beam will show the behaviour of the state $\Lambda_{nm}(\mathcal{E}^*(\hat{\rho})) = \Theta_{nm}(\mathcal{E}^*(\hat{\rho}))$ if Alice's measurement shows the value z_{nm} . Thus we have teleported the state $\hat{\rho}$ on $\mathcal{H}$ from the region X_1 into the region X_2 .

References

- [1] Accardi, L. and Ohya, M.: *Teleportation of general quantum states*, Volterra Center preprint, 1998.
- [2] Accardi L., Ohya M.: *Compound channels, transition expectations and liftings*, Applied Mathematics & Optimization, **39**, 33–59, 1999.
- [3] Benneth, C. H., Brassard, G., Crépeau, C., Jozsa, R., Peres, A. and Wootters, W.: *Teleporting an unknown quantum state via Dual Classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels*. Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895–1899, 1993.
- [4] Bennett, C.H., G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J.A. Smolin, W.K. Wootters, *Purification of noisy entanglement and faithful teleportation via noisy channels*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 722–725, 1996.
- [5] A.K. Ekert, Quantum cryptography based on Bell's theorem, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661–663, 1991.
- [6] Fichtner, Karl-Heinz and Freudenberg, W.: *Point processes and the position distribution of infinite boson systems*. J. Stat. Phys. **47**, 959–978, 1987.
- [7] Fichtner, Karl-Heinz and Freudenberg, W.: *Characterization of states of infinite Boson systems I. – On the construction of states*. Comm. Math. Phys. **137**, 315–357, 1991.
- [8] Fichtner, K-H., Freudenberg, W. and Liebscher, V.: *Time evolution and invariance of Boson systems given by beam splittings*, In finite Dim. Anal., Quantum Prob. and related topics I, 511–533, 1998.
- [9] Lindsay, J. M.: *Quantum and Noncausal Stochastic Calculus*. Prob. Th. Rel. Fields **97**, 65–80, 1993.
- [10] Fichtner, K.-H. and Winkler, G.: *Generalized brownian motion, point processes and stochastic calculus for random fields*. Math. Nachr. **161**, 291–307, 1993.
- [11] Inoue, K, Ohya, M. and Suyari, H.: *Characterization of quantum teleportation processes by nonlinear quantum mutual entropy*, Physica D, **120**, 117–124, 1998.